

what this did not reflect was the exceptions, the provisions that were added last night that had to be added by hand here on the floor so that as I tried to talk to my colleagues here on the floor and pointed out that our Republican leadership had added an exception, they didn't know that, and I had to show them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I felt it was important to explain why a bill that I was listed as a cosponsor on ended up with my voting "no" on it, because it was a good bill. My friend, TED YOHO, is a good man. He is a very dear friend. I think the world of him, and he had a good bill here. The purpose is, it says, "to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief."

It was basically to make clear that the President had no authority to do what he did when he started granting amnesty-type work permits to 5 million people who were unauthorized aliens, as the law calls them. My friend Congressman YOHO's bill was entitled the Executive Amnesty Prevention Act of 2014. The title was changed by leadership, and it became the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act, and the exception that was added—and I won't read the whole thing—in part the exception says that basically this law that was passed by the House this evening shall apply except for humanitarian purposes where the aliens are at imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death.

Now, I don't personally think that exception applies right now, but this administration has been using similar exceptions like that to grant amnesty in the way of asylum and refugee status to people that should not have gotten it, but they are already claiming this exception. So it is kind of like what happened at the end of July when our leadership, we had some great principles all Republicans agreed on regarding dealing with the border issue, the immigration issues, all of us agreed on the principles, but nobody got to see the bill until late Tuesday. I finished reading it about 2 a.m. and then got up at 5 a.m. and reread it, and it was a disaster. It was a de facto amnesty bill. So we only had 1 day basically to get the word out that this is a bad bill because we voted on Thursday, and by Thursday, people had awakened, realized it was a de facto amnesty bill, we got it fixed, so very late Friday night around 10 p.m. or so, we passed a good border bill.

I know that is news to the President because nobody let him know. He didn't know the House had actually acted. But on this one, by adding that exception, I know the President issued a veto threat, but he probably didn't know about the exception being added either, because if you saw the official printout of the bill, it didn't include that exception. But if the Senate came through and passed this same bill with that exception, the President could ac-

tually claim that this exception on here legalizes what he had done illegally as an executive amnesty provision to give these work permits. So the bill that I was willing to cosponsor completely changed in the addition of that exception. It wasn't just the title that changed.

On the National Defense Authorization Act, BUCK McKEON worked very hard on that bill. The people on Armed Services worked very hard. I was very proud of them. They got things in that bill that we have been fighting for. For example, Fort Hood was not workplace violence. That was an act of war against our military members. The law should have reflected it, and the President should have reflected it. But, instead, those military members, those patriots of ours, had been mistreated. They have not been given the Purple Heart they deserved. They have not been given the benefits they deserved, and that needed to be fixed. That fix got in this NDAA, and I am very grateful to BUCK McKEON for getting that in there.

Another problem, we have had this administration going after chaplains for saying things like "in Jesus' name." They pray in Jesus' name because as a Christian, Jesus said, if you pray in My name, then it will be answered—but not always "yes." So chaplains were told it doesn't matter what your religious beliefs are, you can't pray in Jesus' name, and we have got to get rid of all the crosses. The place I reported to every morning for 4 years at Fort Benning had a chapel across the street. Under the orders I had seen, apparently they would have to remove their crosses.

□ 1700

Well, the provision in the NDAA extended religious freedom to our chaplains. It should have been a no-brainer, shouldn't have been required to have been said, but in this administration, it did.

Also, something that many of us have had problems with was the Authorization for Use of Military Force going back to September 2001, after the 9/11 attacks. It gave the President way too much power.

Some thought it was the NDAA that gave too much power, but actually, it was the AUMF. We amended that. The Gohmert amendment help amend that, but I feel a lot better under this NDAA because the AUMF is finally not continued anymore, so that was a good thing.

The problem is the NDAA—this massive National Defense Authorization Act that is a big, important bill—got to the Rules Committee last night. We didn't have a chance to read it. I am anal enough, I actually try to read these important bills, and I didn't have time to read this bill.

What happened to our 72-hour promise? Well, actually, it was a 3-day promise, and that has been whittled down since then, but we didn't have the

3 days that were originally promised by Republicans.

I knew the bill increased TRICARE costs. I wasn't happy about that. I voted no against a process that takes something as important as our national defense and said, "Here you go, here is the whole thing, trust us. Vote for it." We didn't have a chance to review it.

Were there any powers in this thing given additionally to the NSA? Is there any more power to spy on Americans under this bill? I don't know. I couldn't vote for a bill that was launched on us last night that is this important, and I deeply regret it with the good things that were in here.

There were numerous good things, well thought out, but you can't push a bill this important on us, especially when we know there are problems, we just don't get a chance to find them. Can't vote yes—I couldn't in good conscience vote yes.

One additional irony, Mr. Speaker, I had run for Republican Study Committee chair, and I knew if I were elected chair of the Republican Study Committee, I would still vote as representative of my district in Texas, but I also knew if I were representing a majority of the feelings of the Republican Study Committee, I should not and would not be in a position to speak out as boldly against a majority of the people in my organization.

Maybe it is fortunate I am not the RSC chair, so I am here to complain about the abuses when they happen by our own leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF DWAYNE ALONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I always appreciate that opportunity to come here and voice some of the things that are expressions often of the voices of my district and also the voices of Iowans, the voices of the American people.

I happen to live in a place that is the best place in the world to live and raise a family. The anchor of the values that are there and the culture in the neighborhood are reflected in the people.

I rise today, and I come to the floor to express my sadness at the passing of a very, very good friend and a great man, Dwayne Alons. Dwayne Alons passed away Saturday night after a short but brutal illness with cancer.

His life meant so much to so many of us. He lived in Sioux County. Sioux County is that place where I would think, if I would go to sleep and wake up in the park in Sioux County, I would think I might have died and gone to heaven.

It has got the best balance of faith and churches and economics and education and families and culture and work ethic and neighborliness. It has got the best balance of anyplace I know, and Dwayne Alons contributed so much to that.

In almost all of my years that I was in the State legislature, I served in the senate while he served in the house of representatives. When I needed a partner on a cause over in the house, it was Representative Dwayne Alons that I called upon, and it was he that came over to talk to me when I needed some help on my side or if he needed help on the senate side where I served. We stood in the same philosophical and ideological square year after year after year.

The 6-year endeavor that I had embarked upon in 1996 and early 1997 to establish English as the official language of the State of Iowa, that effort came up short in the first general assembly. That was 1997 and 1998; then, in 1999 and 2000, that effort came up short again.

In the next general assembly, I talked to Dwayne Alons, and he agreed that he would be the individual carrying the bill in the house of representatives, and there, in that general assembly, after 6 years of trying, we were able to pass English as the official language over from the senate to the house, and there, Representative Dwayne Alons floor-managed the bill, and we were able to put that bill on then-Governor Tom Vilsack, a Democrat's desk, where he signed the bill that established English as the official language of the State of Iowa. That was a crowning achievement of much of the work that we had done together.

We also opposed the Iowa State Supreme Court's decision called *Varnum v. Brien*, when the supreme court, magically, unanimously decided that, somehow, in the ratification of our State constitution and their equivalent of the 14th Amendment of the Equal Protection Clause that they had magically written in there, that marriage didn't necessarily have to be between a man and a woman.

We were able to pass legislation earlier in 1998 that established that a marriage in Iowa would be between one male and one female. Representative Alons definitely supported that. When the judges unanimously decided that they could rewrite Iowa law without a legitimate legal and logical constitutional basis, it was Dwayne Alons that stepped up to defend marriage between a man and a woman.

He did so without apology. He did so without reservation. He did so because he always acted on his convictions. He carried deep convictions.

He had a style not at all similar to mine, Mr. Speaker, a quiet, understated, respectful style, a strong, faithful man who was also a prayer warrior. Whenever there was a Bible study group, you could look around and Dwayne Alons and his wife, Clarice, would be there.

I would like to just chronicle some of the milestones along in his life that he represented the Fourth and then I think, later on, the Fifth District in the State of Iowa.

He also joined the Air Force and became a fighter pilot, an F-16 pilot, and rose to the rank of brigadier general in the Iowa Air National Guard, the 185th—the beloved 185th. He raised a pilot, his son Kevin.

That example that was before his four children was one that they acted on. He had such an influence on their lives, on the lives of their four children and their 14 grandchildren—a quiet, respectful, staid, resolute voice that lived by example. When he spoke, you knew you wanted to hear what Dwayne Alons had to say.

He was stricken by cancer in September and taken just right after Thanksgiving, but his wife, Clarice, they had 47-plus years and the four children that they raised and the 14 grandchildren, and their daughters-in-law and sons-in-law and a host of family and friends remember Dwayne, remember him as I did, grateful to God that we had him as a gift to us and had an opportunity to get to know him, an opportunity to call him a friend, to work with him, to pray with him.

On his last days, I had the privilege to stop and see him in the hospital where I think we all knew that he was in his last days, and I was able to go to his bedside and hold his hand and offer a deep prayer with and for him, and the strength that he had left after I said, "Amen," he said, "Now I am going to say a short prayer of my own," which I could hear—I could barely hear—but in that, there was a message to me, "Don't let up, don't give up, keep up the fight, keep up the fight," as Dwayne did for his whole lifetime in a quiet and a polite and a respectful way, but as a leader.

He led by example, he led by conviction, he led with the moral authority of a man who knew who he was, a man who understood his faith, a man who understood the Constitution and the rule of law, the structure of government and his role in society as a father, as a grandfather, as a husband, as a friend, as a State representative, as a brigadier general in the Air Guard, and as a father of another officer in the Guard.

As I think about Dwayne Alons and think about having to say goodbye to such a good friend, I look at the back of the announcement here for the funeral, and it couldn't be more fitting. It is something that, of course, I think the language has been embedded into the hearts and the minds of the American people, and it is the poem "High Flight."

As an F-16 pilot, as a general, he always saw the clear blue skies, and "High Flight" says this:

Oh, I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth

Of Sun-split clouds—and done a hundred things

You have not dreamed of—wheeled and soared and swung

High in the sunlit silence. Hov'ring there, I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung

My eager craft through footless halls of air

Up, up the long, delirious burning blue I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace

Where never lark, or even eagle flew—

And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod, The high untrespassed sanctity of space, Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

That was the life of Dwayne Alons, my pheasant-hunting friend, my legislating friend, my Bible-studying friend, my air warrior friend, and my prayer warrior friend, General Representative Dwayne Alons, may he rest in peace, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate your attention to his life and the opportunity to place some of these memories into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here. His last ask of me and his last prayer, which was not for him but for me, tells you something about the sacrifice and the will of the man that we have lost as a servant to our country, but his inspiration lives beyond, keep it up, don't let up—understood the Constitution.

Here we sit today, Mr. Speaker, with a President who lectured on the Constitution for 10 years as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago and many times lectured about the separation of powers.

Article I is the legislative body of the government, this Congress, comprised of a House and a Senate. Article II is the executive branch, the President and the people that he gets to command. Article III are the courts.

The separation of powers that was defined by our Founding Fathers, this was not three equal or coequal branches of government—not designed to be, Mr. Speaker; instead, the legislative branch was designed to be a pre-eminent branch of this government, article I, the branch closest to the people, most responsive to the people, and most accountable to the people.

Of the legislative branch, of the article I, the two bodies of the Senate and the House, it is the House of Representatives that is established to be the quick reaction force. Up for election every 2 years, so that if the people are dissatisfied with their Representatives in the United States Congress and the policies that we bring forth, then the people have an opportunity to change out those seats in this House of Representatives, all 435 of them, within each 2 years, we are all up for election or reelection.

If the people decided they wanted to throw out all 435 of us, they had their chance just about a month ago today, and if they decide 2 years from now, short a month, that they want to throw out everybody in the House of Representatives, that is what they do. Our Founding Fathers wanted that restraint on this House.

They wanted this House to have the most control. They wanted the House of Representatives to be where most ideas originated—not all of them, most of them. They wanted us to be the place where we fought out these ideas, and the genius of it is this: each of us represents 750,000 or so people here; each of us in the House of Representatives represents about that many people.

Out there in America, 316 or so million Americans, all of the good ideas that this government needs to consider are out there in the hearts and minds of our people.

□ 1715

And our job in this constitutional Republic is, go home, listen to the people whom you have the honor and the privilege to represent, listen to them, exchange ideas with them because we are not charged to be devoid of ideas and simply carrying their ideas here. We are charged in this Republic with having a responsibility to get informed, be informed, stay informed, do this full time, so that we are giving all of our heads, all of our hearts and all that we can to this job that we have.

We owe our constituents our best effort and our best judgment, and that includes go home and listen to them. Gather the best ideas that can come out of our districts. Bring them here. Each one of these seats in this place should have within it, within the mind and within the records and within the staff of each one of us and our staff, we should have the best ideas that come from our district. They should be incorporated with the best ideas that we can generate.

We should bring those ideas into this idea marketplace and test them; and while we are doing that, we are evaluating the best ideas that come from the other 434 Members of Congress that come here with the best ideas that they can gather. And throughout that all, with that competition of ideas, the competition of debate, the regular order that we ought to structure here and keep, to the extent that it is possible, then those ideas get written into bills and those bills need to go before subcommittees for hearings, and then they need to go before the subcommittee and the full committee for markup so that the people in the committee that presumably have the most expertise on the topic have an opportunity to perfect that legislation.

Then out of committee it needs to come to the floor where the Rules Committee should be allowing the maximum amount of input from the Members. There is not one single Member of this House of Representatives that has the market cornered on all the good ideas; and there is not one single Member here that represents enough more people within their district that they ought to have more leverage than anybody else.

There has to be a leadership structure, that is true, but that doesn't

mean that there is only one or two or three places where the ideas can be approved. It needs to be the best ideas that can come from the people of the United States of America.

That is the structure in our constitutional Republic, and we should have the closest thing to regular order that we can maintain. If it means we work longer, if it means we work harder, we should do that. And we should send our best ideas over across the rotunda to the Senate. There in the Senate, they can generate some ideas, too, and bring those ideas from the States. But they are only up for election once every 6 years, which means, Mr. Speaker, that they have a little bit different attitude about what they can vote for, what they are willing to support, and where the leverage might be over there.

But in the end, this is about bringing the best ideas that exist in America, process them through this competition of ideas in this great debate forum that we have, and let those best ideas emerge to the top.

Mr. Speaker, sitting here in this place, we have a President that thinks that he does all of that. We have a President who thinks that, even though he lectured on the Constitution and the separation of powers and understands that all legislative power and authority exists in the Congress, not in the President of the United States. It exists in the Congress of the United States.

When you look at our Founding Fathers, they had a habit of putting things down in priority order. One of those examples that I would place into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, is in the Declaration of Independence. That is not an independent document from the Constitution. The Declaration is the promise; the Constitution is the fulfillment of the promise that is in the Declaration: life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, in that order. They didn't say, pursuit of happiness, liberty, then life. They didn't say, liberty, pursuit of happiness, then life. It is life, liberty, pursuit of happiness. That is because they are prioritized rights.

Life is the paramount right. It takes precedence over any other right. The second that was established in the Declaration was liberty, God-given liberty. Our Founding Fathers are the ones that articulated that, put it on the parchment, and pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor to that cause.

Pursuit of happiness, by the way, is not just envisioned by our Founding Fathers to be what I think some people think it is, like this endless tailgate party in this pursuit of happiness. Pursuit of happiness is the development of the whole human being. Some pronounce the Greek term for that is "eudemonia." That means the development of the whole human being—physically, mentally, spiritually, intellectually, knowledge-based, all of those things put together—as someone who, enjoying the rights of life and liberty,

is contributing back to that society and civilization and to the government of, by, and for the people. That is what pursuit of happiness is.

But it still is trumped by liberty, and liberty is trumped by life. No one in the exercise of their liberty can take someone else's life, and no one in the exercise of their pursuit of happiness can take away someone else's liberty or life. That is the order; that is the priority.

So, with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that our Founding Fathers envisioned—and they wrote it in the Constitution, to put it bluntly—article I. They didn't start out with article II or article III. If they declared article I to be the executive branch of government, one might be able to read into this that the President has a little more power than he does. They wanted to make sure the people had the power.

So they wrote in article I, the very first sentence, article I, section 1:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

That is an irrefutable first truth in the Constitution of the United States. That is what Barack Obama taught at the University of Chicago. That is the foundation of article I.

The President of the United States, he is the embodiment at the top of the executive branch of government. And it says in the beginning of article II:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the vice president, chosen for that same term, be elected, as follows.

It doesn't actually say that the President, in the first sentence, has this massive power. In fact, nowhere in article II does it say that the President has this massive power to legislate because it is exclusively reserved for the Congress of the United States in the very first sentence, article I, section 1.

So this little lecture that I have provided here, Mr. Speaker—and I know you know all of this to be fact—it is pretty similar to the lectures I imagine the President delivered at the University of Chicago, and it reflects the expressions that he has made of his constitutional understanding at least 22 times into the public record when he said: I don't have the authority to grant amnesty.

Now, I am summarizing this, of course. He wouldn't use that word himself.

He said he didn't have the authority on March 28, 2011, at the high school here in Washington, D.C. He said: I know you want me to pass the DREAM Act and establish it, but you are studying. You are smart students. You are studying the Constitution. You know that I don't have the authority to do that. The Congress writes the laws. The legislature writes the laws. I am head of the executive branch as President. My job is to enforce the laws, and the

judicial branch of government's job is to interpret the laws.

That is a pretty concise description of what this Constitution does, that statement, and at least 21 other statements by the President of the United States, in his declaration—his declaration—that he didn't have the authority to legislate.

Then, lo and behold, the President of the United States had a change of heart. He stopped saying he didn't have the authority for several months, didn't seem so curious because he was floating trial balloons about advancing an executive amnesty. Those trial balloons floated out June, July, August, September, October. He announced at some point—or leaked it out—that he wouldn't commit his executive amnesty until after the election for fear there would be consequences for such a thing, and so he held back.

Then a couple of weeks ago, on a Thursday night, he gave an address at 8 on a Thursday night to a national audience that more or less laid out his executive amnesty, which as many times has been characterized as “unconstitutional.”

The President then decided he could write immigration law and he could waive the application of the law and the enforcement of the law for vast classes and groups of people that he defined in his executive edict. That number of people may be 5 million. We know historically whenever there has been an amnesty, there has been a massive amount of fraud and a significant amount of underestimation of the real numbers, whether it is 5 million or it is a multiplier of 5 million. I don't think anybody thinks it is going to end up being less than 5 million people.

Now we have a bunch of people that came into America that many of whom committed the crime of illegal border crossing. There are some who overstayed their visas, and they are not technically criminals. They have committed a serious misdemeanor overstaying their visa. In both cases, the law removes them from the United States. That is what the law is.

But the President has decided that he can create these classes of people, exempt them from the law, reward them with a permission slip to stay in the United States and a work permit. Some of it is going to turn into green cards.

So this has been a massive effort to usurp the authority of the United States Congress to pass laws. And for the President to give his oath of office and take that oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help him God—he is obligated to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. Instead, he has taken the Constitution—figuratively speaking—separated out article I of the Constitution, torn it out, and said: I do the law, too. Folded it, put it in his shirt pocket, and walked away from the podium in the East Room that night.

Now here we are. We are a Nation thrown into a constitutional crisis, a Nation that was struggling to restore the respect for the rule of law as far back as Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act. I remember what that was like. I remember what I thought. I am not Monday morning quarterbacking that. I believe Ronald Reagan would stand the principle and veto the '86 Amnesty Act, because anything less meant that there was an implicit promise that there would be another amnesty, another amnesty, and another amnesty; and when you reward lawbreakers, you get more lawbreakers.

I have been working since '86 to restore the respect for the rule of law, and I have watched it be eroded since, one might say by each succeeding President, Mr. Speaker, but no one has eroded the respect for the rule of law from the White House nearly to the extent as this President.

So as I see what is happening in America, I have been wanting to, working here in this Congress, to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism, those pillars, many of which you find in the Bill of Rights, the first ten Amendments to the Constitution, but just in the first one: freedom of speech, religion, press, the right to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances. The Second Amendment's right to keep and bear arms. It goes on and on.

The Bill of Rights is replete of pillars of American exceptionalism, any one of which, if you pulled it out, this giant shining city on a hill that is built upon those beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism, that are drilled down to bedrock, that seek this country and its greatness and the greatness of people that are here, you pull any one of them out, we don't become the great country that we are today.

But the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, the rule of law, the essential pillar of American exceptionalism, that idea that no man—meaning also in this world, no woman either—is above the law. We get equal protection under the law, and we are all treated equally before the law. That rule of law is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism without which we could not have become this great Nation, neither can we sustain ourselves as a great Nation.

But I am watching as it is torn asunder by a willful act of an individual that knows better. We know he knows better because he lectured for 10 years better. And he gave us 22 speeches across the country that told us that he knew better, and then flipped and did this to throw this America into a constitutional crisis.

Then what are our alternatives here in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate? We have a majority in the Republicans coming into the United States Senate. It will soon be nine freshman Republicans that will arrive on the floor of the United States Senate to take their

oath of office in January of 2015, not that long from now.

□ 1730

Here in the House, we are going to end up with 247 Republicans, which is a pretty good-sized majority here in the House of Representatives—the largest majority we have had since sometime back in the Roaring Twenties. That is 15 new Republicans seated in the House of Representatives.

Some say: Well, why don't we just wait and we'll pick up better ground to fight on. We can fight better maybe in January. So let's do a continuing resolution. Maybe we'll just kick the whole omnibus can all the way down the road until September 30.

But we surely can't do this. We surely can't let the President shut the government down. So we'll say there won't be a government shutdown, which is a promise that we're not going to defund the President's lawless act.

Now, if we announce that we are not willing to use the tools that are here in this Constitution in my jacket pocket, carefully given to the House of Representatives especially, but also the Senate, that gives the power of the purse to the Congress, in the Federalist Papers it is very clear that our Founding Fathers intended for this Congress to have the power of the purse because with the power of the purse comes the authority to control everything the executive branch does, if we so choose.

We can write language that is limiting language. We can write language that says: Here's all the money you want, Mr. President. You've already soared through \$17 trillion in national debt—and now, \$18 trillion in national debt. We'll scoop you up a few hundred more billion dollars. In fact, we'll scoop you trillions of dollars over there. And you can spend whatever it is that we have agreed in the discussions with Senator REID and the President of the United States. We are going to provide for money because we don't want to fight. We don't want to fight.

Yes, we do. We have an obligation. And we have to. Money can be compromised if money is not a principle. The Constitution of the United States cannot be compromised; it is a principle. And we take an oath to uphold the Constitution here, 435 of us standing in this same place next January, again. It doesn't mean you get this caveat that says I don't like the politics of defending the Constitution. It doesn't mean that this is too painful for me so I am not going to do it. It doesn't even mean I disagree with the policy so I am not going to defend the Constitution.

What it means is you take an oath to uphold the Constitution, come what may, without regard to political consequences, without regard to policy implications, with complete regard to the oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is our oath. And if the President doesn't keep his, we are ever more obligated to keep ours. That is what we

must do. And the most reasonable tool that we have is the tool that defunds the President's lawless executive edicts.

That is what must be done, and it must be done on appropriation bills that are must-pass, that the President wants, which means now, given an understanding that they continued to issue permits throughout the government shutdown 14 months ago. That is under USCIS. They functioned during a government shutdown, issuing DACA permits—the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—and they continued to exercise these nonprosecutorial discretion Morton memos. They were doing those things, Mr. Speaker, during a government shutdown. So they declared it, apparently, to be an essential service, or they went off on the loop of it being fee-based.

We can write language into the next appropriation bill—and it should be a very short CR that gets us into next year—and that language must shut off the funding to the President's lawless act that he committed and knew what he was doing.

We need to do it now. It is a matter of principle. When you are called upon to keep your oath of office, you don't get to decide that there is going to be another time, a better time. If we vote to fund the President's lawlessness, Mr. Speaker, we don't get our virtue back in January, February, and March of next year. We must uphold the Constitution now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a family illness.

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for December 2, 3, and today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical issues.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 390 0 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2523. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 2759. An act to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 43. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 669. An act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 1391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3682. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of cer-

tain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5069. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5681. An act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2040. An Act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 8, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8143. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of troop reduction pursuant to 10 U.S.C. Section 993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8144. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Pearsall, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-23] [RM-11690] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8145. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Aging Management of Loss of Coating or Lining Integrity for Internal Coatings/Linings on In-Scope Piping, Piping Components, Heat Exchangers, and Tanks [NRC-2014-0004] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8146. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 14-14, informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum